

PEST MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MAY 12, 2011

Meeting Summary

PMAC members in attendance

Chris Reardon, DPR Chief Deputy Director, PMAC Chair
John Aguirre, CA Association of Winegrape Growers
David Bakke, US Forest Service
Henry Buckwalter, Western Plant Health Association
Caroline Cox, Center for Environmental Health
Joseph Grant, UC Cooperative Extension
Mary Grisier, US EPA, Region 9
Anne Katten, CA Rural Legal Assistance Foundation
Pam Marrone, Marrone Bio Innovations, Inc.
Rick Melnicoe, UCD Pesticide Impact Assessment Program
Belinda Morris, Environmental Defense Fund
Laurie Nelson, Consumer Specialty Products Association
Renee Rianda, Morning Star Packing Co.
Rebecca Sisco, UC Davis, Western Region IR4 Program
Dave Tamayo, CA Association of Sanitation Agencies
Darren Van Steenwyk, Clark Pest Control

Interested parties also in attendance

John Steggall, CA Department of Food and Agriculture

DPR staff in attendance

Nita Davidson
Veda Federighi
Chris Jones Roberts
Marshall Lee
Mark Robertson
Ann Schaffner
Kim Steinmann

Facilitation

Joseph McIntyre, Ag Innovations Network
Serena Coltrane-Briscoe, Ag Innovations Network (*notes*)

Background

Marshall Lee gave background on the Alliance grant program. Changes in the 2011 grant cycle include: revised solicitation materials; an expanded contact list for greater outreach; and a revamped website for easier navigation. Fourteen projects were submitted for consideration, and five were selected for full proposals. Everyone used the same scoring criteria; however more weight was given to the management team.

The appropriated budget for the grant program is \$404,000 and two projects may be funded. Any unspent money goes back to the DPR fund and cannot be rolled into the next year.

Meeting Goals

- Discuss the strengths/weaknesses of each project
- Develop consensus
- Make recommendation to DPR management team

Alliance Grants

SUBMITTED PROPOSALS FOR 2011–12 CYCLE	
1	Improving Health through IPM in Fresno
	Carmean Pest Management
2	A Demonstration Using Non-chemical IPM Practices to Control Bed Bugs in California
	UC Berkeley
3	Got Ants? Outreach to Reduce Risks from Pyrethroids to the Environment and Water Quality
	ABAG for SF Estuary Partnership
4	Green Cleaning, Sanitizing, and Disinfecting: A Toolkit for Early Care and Education
	UCSF
5	Monterey Bay Green Gardener Landscape IPM Retrofit Program
	Ecology Action

DPR staff presented each proposal followed by a discussion on each proposal. DPR staff did not participate in the discussion except to answer questions.

1. Improving Health through Integrated Pest Management in Fresno

PI: Ingrid Carmean, Carmean Pest Management

\$199.8K | 2 years, 8 months

Location: Fresno

Audience: building residents, staff & managers, local and regional health and housing departments

Goals & Objectives

- Increase access to IPM practices in urban, low-income communities in Fresno.
- Enable adoption of IPM practices among building tenants, maintenance staff & managers, and building owners through education and trainings.

- Educate health and housing agencies, building management, staff, and residents about IPM; create curriculum and Healthy Homes kit.
- Train promotoras and follow their progress with residents; a 70% reduction in roaches is anticipated.
- Work with faith-based/community public health groups, city & county agencies, and others involved with health care and asthma prevention; have collaborated on lead abatement in the past.
- Budget (in decreasing proportions): personnel, overhead, operations.

Discussion

- Concern around the fact that two pages of the proposal were copied from the Healthy Homes Alliance Project, in which "Los Angeles" was replaced with "Fresno." Martha Arguello, the PI for Healthy Homes, trained the Fresno applicants.
- Q: Could DPR have rejected the proposal because of this? A: No, there are no criteria concerning the use of original material.
- DPR wants to encourage emulation of successful projects, but noted that this may indicate lack of knowledge on the applicant's part. One member responded that the PI does indeed have knowledge in this area. DPR staff reminded members that the law requires proposals to be judged only on content not personal knowledge of applicants.
- Standard deviations of scores would be helpful. Marshall replied that this was considered but not useful for proposal scoring.

2. A Demonstration Using Non-chemical IPM Practices to Control Bed Bugs in California

PI: Vernard Lewis, UC Berkeley

\$175.9K | 2 years, 7 months

Location: CA, exact location unspecified

Audience: PMPs, building managers & residents, other stakeholders

Goals & Objectives

- Demonstrate non-chemical IPM approach for managing bed bugs in multi-unit housing.
- Educate residents, building managers, pest management professionals; show that residents can participate in management practices.
- Promote widespread adoption of non-chemical IPM beyond the initial project – college/university, hospitality, health department audiences.
- Curriculum & seminars for PMPs; surveys for residents; journal articles & seminars for stakeholders; exchange of information.
- Budget (in decreasing proportions): personnel, overhead, travel, operating.

Discussion

- Unsure what the applicants mean by "non-chemical IPM" given that IPM is an approach in which you start with the least-toxic and work your way up.
- Q: Can a complete non-chemical approach be called IPM? A: In this case they are using some chemicals, but they are safer chemicals. This was an error in the way they described their approach.

3. Got Ants? Outreach to Reduce Risks from Pyrethroids to the Environment and Water Quality

PI: Athena Honore, ABAG for SF Estuary Partnership

\$200K | 2 years, 4 months

Location: SF Bay Area, Central Coast, Sacramento, Santa Monica

Audience: PMPs, general public

Goals & Objectives

- Promote least toxic ant management among residents and IPM professionals via social marketing; improve and increase public awareness of IPM and how to manage ants.
- Change behavior through commitments, prompts, norms, incentives, and removing barriers (including cost).
- Reduce use of fipronil and pyrethroids by 5% among PMPs and Bay Area residents.
- Budget (in decreasing proportions): personnel, contracts (UC IPM and Ecowise, as well as for consultant outreach, a survey, materials/graphics, website development, a contingency consultant, and for print/online distribution).

Discussion

- What is the interplay between consultants? Some consulting work seems to be marketing to help approach audience and change behavior.
- Is it unusual for an Alliance grant to have such a high percentage of contracts in the budget? One of last year's projects was this way and is working well.

4. Green Cleaning, Sanitizing, and Disinfecting: A Toolkit for Early Care and Education (ECE)

PI: Vickie Leonard, UCSF

\$199.9K | 2 years

Location: California

Audience: ECE providers, parents, childcare regulators

Goals & Objectives

- Address exposure to antimicrobial pesticides (AP) in early care and education; although they are used to prevent spread of infectious disease, they pose a health risk to children and staff.
- Promote hygiene practices, less toxic AP alternatives, and non-chemical disinfection technologies that reduce the spread of infectious disease and improve health and safety of children and staff.
- Develop a user-friendly toolkit to reduce the use of APs that pose health risks; the most current curricula on cleaning in this setting are 10 years old.
- Educate ECE providers about alternative products/practices and health risks via toolkit; conduct outreach/workshops; establish partnerships.
- Budget (in decreasing proportions): personnel, contracts (UC Berkeley, Informed Green Solutions, strategic graphic design), operations, travel, overhead.

Discussion

- Q: Are the listed partners already signed on to the project? There should be a consistent message across health department. A: Yes, they have signed on.
- Alameda County Lead Poisoning Prevention Program will assist with the toolkit.
- A similar project by the same PI (a pest management guidebook for childcare centers across the state) is just finishing up. There is a personnel overlap with this project. Q: How did that project go? A: That guidebook came out well and was effective.
- The benefits of the green cleaning application were discussed early on and deemed appropriate. There will be different management on this project. Personnel and facilities costs have gone up since the previous PMA, so it's not surprising that they couldn't include line items such as Spanish translation.

5. Monterey Bay Green Gardeners

PI: Sherry Lee Bryan, Ecology Action

\$75.562K | 1 year, 3 months

Location: Monterey Bay Area

Audience: Professional landscapers, residential gardeners

Goals & Objectives

- Provide opportunities and financial incentives to encourage IPM in urban areas that affect the waterways that drain to the Monterey Bay; promote Ocean Friendly Gardens (OFGs).
- Educate 70 landscape workers via classes, hands-on opportunities, and bilingual materials.
- Design and install 50 gardens that meet OFG criteria, which includes IPM, water efficiency, and more.
- Budget (in decreasing proportions): personnel, contracts, construction, operating, overhead.

Discussion

- The budget is smaller than the other proposals, so if this one is chosen, the extra money will go back into DPR's budget. Last year, it was agreed that the PMAC would not suggest budget changes, that is, the committee would not provisionally recommend projects providing certain budget changes are made. This often did not work out as, after discussion with applicants, it became apparent that the changes were not feasible and would have adversely affected the proposed project.
- Financial incentives were listed as part of the budget. However, these cannot be funded by DPR; matching funds can cover this, which would be stated in the contract should this project be funded.

Initial Poll

Before the meeting, 10 PMAC members reviewed and scored the projects. A summary of this review and ranking follows:

California Department of Pesticide Regulation
Pest Management Advisory Committee Meeting Summary, May 12, 2011

2011/2012 Alliance Grant Review Summary by Reviewer																
Reviewer																
Project	Average	Rank	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	Average	Rank	\$ Requested	
Ants	80.6	1	80	71	86	78	85	97	96	81	62	70	80.6	1	\$ 200,000	
Monterey Gardener	80.4	2	81	88	87	77	64	68	84	94	81	80	80.4	2	\$ 75,562	
Green Cleaning	75.8	3	88	74	89	89	77	80	86	68	57	50	75.8	3	\$ 199,966	
Bed Bugs	73.5	4	90	57	93	83	52	88	69	73	69	61	73.5	4	\$ 175,852	
IPM Fresno	71.9	5	94	67	95	72	58	70	62	92	66	43	71.9	5	\$ 199,830	

Process Question

Q: PMAC member Dave Tamayo is part of the management team for one the grants and has an interest in the success of that project. Should he participate in the discussion and voting, or would that be inappropriate? A: Dave does not receive financial benefit from the grant award, so it was felt to be okay. It is hard to get a group of knowledgeable people who don't have some interest in or knowledge about the projects or their personnel. Another member raised the concern that the project in question shows up first in the ranking, and wonders if that had to do with Dave's vote. Dave responded that he actually ranked it as third. It was determined that there was no formal conflict of interest, so Dave was allowed participate.

Project Scoring

Members agreed to a vote to select the top three projects. The ten members who had reviewed the proposals conducted a round of scoring. It was noted that all members would participate in the final deliberations.

Poll 1: Top Three

2011/2012 Alliance Grant Review Summary by Reviewer													
Reviewer													
Project	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10	Average	Rank	
Ants	1	4	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	4	2.3	2	
Monterey Gardener	2	1	4	4	4	2	1	4	4	2	2.8	3	
Green Cleaning	4	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	1	2.1	1	

Discussion

- Concern was expressed that the two proposals most relevant to the environmental justice perspective (i.e. addressing low-income communities) got the lowest ranking; these should be considered.
 - One member expressed that neither of these proposals was well-written.
 - DPR encourages groups to reapply; they give generic advice to everyone, as well as specific feedback to those who request it.
 - From a pest management perspective, bed bugs are not limited to low-income communities; in fact, the proposal did not state low-income as target audience.
 - The issue of bed bugs is relevant to low-income people; but then so is gardening and green cleaning, as both proposals will benefit workers.

All members agreed to proceed with the top three.

- The group may want to discuss giving feedback on grant proposals and may even want to provide assistance to those who may be less familiar with proposal writing.
- May also discuss how to structure grants so that the environmental justice lens can be more of a focus.
- This grant is meant to fund new projects, not to continue existing programs.
- There is a need for further implementation of IPM and a new approach for spreading IPM methods that are already proven.

Deliberations

DPR expressed its particular interest in the strengths and weaknesses of the proposals, as well as how they fit in with DPR priorities.

Comments on Monterey Bay Green Gardener

- Alignment with DPR priorities
 - It seemed to be mostly about weeds rather than insects and diseases; however, the primary residential pesticide use is on weeds – the approach of reducing pesticide use by planting landscapes that require fewer pesticides is a good one.
 - The focus seems to be on water conservation; it's thin on pesticide and nutrient issues other than indirectly through water conservation metrics; thin on metrics through which they would evaluate project; it might be better suited for DWR.
 - Addressed home/garden landscaping.
 - Addressed groundwater quality.
- Goals/Focus
 - The ultimate goal was unclear, because of the quantity of objectives including water savings, reduction of pesticides, and getting people to build gardens.
 - The holistic approach is a valuable one; however IPM is a side benefit rather than the focus or most important benefit.
 - Good that project addresses worker issues.
- Impact
 - Will this reach a new audience or is the project preaching to the choir?
 - The project is in a wealthy area with motivated people. Will this inspire new projects or would people do this on their own?

- Even people who know better need encouragement to use IPM appropriately in the landscape, and water efficiency information is important as well.
- Demonstration gardens show others that they can do it too; this is a good way to communicate useful IPM practice.
- Evidence that Green Gardener Programs work well – where water goes, pesticides go, too.
- The hands-on approach is good, but not sure it's the area of greatest need or targets the most problematic pesticides.
- Seems very similar to an Alliance demonstration garden in San Jose; wouldn't want to repeat a project that has already been done.
- Should have more outreach in workshops and continuing education regardless of income level.
- The incentives are questionable.
- Weak on measuring outcomes.
- Management
 - Good collaboration: multiple agencies involved, which will help get the word out.
- Budget/Funding
 - Concern about the low funding request and not making the most of the Alliance grant money available.
 - Applicants were brave to apply only for the funds they needed; this is a strong proposal and should not be rejected because of the small budget.
 - Matching funds mean a bigger bang per buck.
 - Money for incentive payments can't come out of a grant, so DPR would have to negotiate with recipients about shifting activities around.
 - Can construction money come out of DPR grant?
 - Too much money is allocated to personnel (this was true in all proposals).

Summary

Pros

- ✓ Addresses worker issues, groundwater quality, and residential landscaping.
- ✓ Demonstration and hands-on approach.
- ✓ Good collaboration.

Cons

- ✓ Focus is broader than just IPM.
- ✓ Unsure that this grant will fill a need that wouldn't be met otherwise.
- ✓ Weak on measuring outcomes.

Comments on *Got Ants?*

- Alignment with DPR priorities
 - DPR is currently writing surface water regulations for urban pest management professionals and will be conducting education – how does this project fit into that?
- Goals/Focus
 - PMAC funded a project by Dr. Rust a few years ago that achieved a 50% reduction; this project only seeks a 5% reduction, which was thought by some to be unambitious. Another member felt that forcing a high threshold level would be

- unrealistic as this is a fairly major shift in people's reactions to pests around their home and is difficult to measure.
- Use of household materials is not known; what products are being used instead of toxic products? There is no way to track this.
- Needed to have been more specific about what the IPM methods were.
- The most attractive part of the project is supporting public IPM service providers and creating a market distinction for that, as the largest amount of pesticides in water supplies come from applications by pest control operators.
- Differentiate indoor/outdoor infestations.
- Impact
 - Many resources have gone into looking at this issue.
 - Better measurement of success needed.
 - The measurable impact is likely large because of water testing.
 - Homeowner education is good – the more you can educate the homeowner, the better.
 - The project increases the demand for IPM and gets the word out.
 - Social networking
 - A good way to get the word out.
 - Focus on website development - how will that work over time?
 - What about other tools for social networking?
 - Hands-on approach preferable to social marketing; will website and marketing actually change habits?
 - Concern over another blast of emails (may add to email overwhelm and be ineffective).
- Management
 - Seems well planned out.
 - Good public agency collaboration.
 - Good that they involve more pest management professionals.
 - Project is missing a PCO as management team member; need someone on team who knows how to control ants in an urban setting.
 - Concern about management.
- Budget/Funding
 - Costs should have been more clearly specified.
 - Is there enough money to actually develop a website?
 - How likely is this project to get funded by sources other than the Alliance grant?
One member feels this is not a relevant question.

Summary

Pros

- ✓ Social marketing approach.
- ✓ Well-planned.
- ✓ Water quality improvement.
- ✓ Engagement with public agencies.

Cons

- ✓ Target reduction seems under-ambitious.
- ✓ Hard to measure outcomes.
- ✓ Effectiveness of social marketing methods for behavior change unclear.

Comments on *Green Cleaning*

- Alignment with DPR priorities
 - Proposal did not state which DPR priority they were addressing; it talked about children's health, but did not mention worker health and safety. Staff responded that there is a worker health issue here.
- Need
 - The issue of workers in childcare being overexposed to cleaning solutions needs to be addressed.
 - There is a need for this since there are no current materials.
 - There is also a need from an economic and environmental perspective.
 - DPR has a robust IPM childcare program. Q: Are cleaning practices part of that IPM? A: Under the law, antimicrobials are exempt from the Healthy Schools program.
 - What is driving the repetitive use of cleaners and the nature of those cleaners? Is this a legal mandate?
- Goals
 - Educating people on the difference between cleaning and disinfecting; finding the appropriate product for the objective.
 - Raising the level of knowledge.
 - Addressing a segment of the pest world we haven't seen before (antimicrobials).
 - Needed to have been more specific about methods, targets, and location.
- Impact
 - How many antimicrobials are seen in waste water? Are they hard to remove in water treatment? Dave thinks they are pretty difficult to remove.
 - Measures of success unclear; weak in adoption and deliverables.
 - Would the project improve anything? There was no real measure of success explained except for fewer illnesses and the asthma argument, which is virtually impossible to measure.
 - Benefits can only be seen in the assessment of outcomes.
 - Good that they combined worker and children's health.
 - The project is oriented to childcare centers, but the materials would be relevant outside childcare centers.
- Management
 - The collaborators have a good track record: materials turned out well, successful outreach. One person felt this was a reason not to fund this project.
 - The project uses a strong existing network for delivering information to the target audience.
 - Good that the public health department is involved.

California Department of Pesticide Regulation
Pest Management Advisory Committee Meeting Summary, May 12, 2011

Summary

Pros

- ✓ Strong team.
- ✓ Different topic.
- ✓ Demonstrated need.
- ✓ Strong track record.

Cons

- ✓ Not sure which DPR priorities are addressed.
- ✓ Measures of success unclear.

Poll #2: Top Two

Scoring members were invited to rank their top two proposals. Proposals had to be selected “as is” with no changes recommended. Members were allowed to vote for just one proposal if desired.

2011/2012 Alliance Grant Review Summary by Reviewer													
Project	Reviewer										Average	Rank	
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6	R7	R8	R9	R10			
Ants	1	4	1	1	2	4	4	1	1	4	2.3	2	
Monterey Gardener	2	1	4	4	4	2	1	4	4	2	2.8	3	
Green Cleaning	4	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	4	1	2.1	1	

Green Cleaning and *Got Ants?* were the top two proposals. All members voted on the following question:

Is this the recommendation we wish to make to the department?

Yes: 13

No: 0

Abstaining: 2

Comments:

- From a professional pest management perspective, the proposal on bed bugs would have been great because the information is needed.
- PMAC might share priority areas with DPR to influence the next round of solicitation. There is a meeting in November to hear from the projects that are concluding; this might be a good time to get priorities from PMAC. Those meetings are full, but DPR is open to having it on the agenda. Alternatively, members could email priorities. Topics of interest include:
 - Environmental justice
 - Bed bugs

California Department of Pesticide Regulation
Pest Management Advisory Committee Meeting Summary, May 12, 2011

- Production agriculture
- Fumigants (all agreed they would like to have researchers present at a meeting about what they are doing on fumigants and what it would take to find alternatives.) **ACTION:** Pam will email names to Veda.
- Water (another meeting topic: what's in it, what's not in it, where it comes from, where it goes, etc. There was already a panel discussion on this, but could have another.)
- It works well to use DPR priorities as the basis for the proposals, and allow grant seekers to relate their project to priorities.
- Would it be more beneficial to have one proposal at a higher amount? This could result in higher quality proposals.
- The environmental justice community tends to be less experienced at grantwriting – might suggest partnerships.

Comments on Process:

- The name of the grant and a short name should be decided when the proposals are sent out to PMAC members. Names, numbers, order in binder, etc. should be consistent throughout process.
- The evaluation score sheet was really easy to use and covered the topics well.

The meeting scheduled for mid-summer may be canceled. A good agenda is needed that is of interest to PMAC. **ACTION:** PMAC members send agenda items to DPR.